
ICANN Transcription

IDNs EPDP

Thursday, 18 May 2023 at 12:00 UTC

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. Attendance and recordings of the call are posted on agenda wiki page: <https://community.icann.org/x/XoZXDg>

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page <http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

DEVAN REED:

Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. Welcome to the IDNs EPDP call, taking place on Thursday, 18 May 2023 at 12:00 UTC. We do have a tentative apology from Edmon Chung.

All members and participants will be promoted to panelists for today's call. Members and participants, when using the chat, please select "Everyone" in order for everyone to see the chat and so it is captured in the recording. Observers will remain as an attendee and will have view-only chat access.

Statements of interest must be kept up to date. If anyone has any updates to share, please raise your hand or speak up now. If you need assistance updating your statements of interest, please email the GNSO Secretariat. All documentation and information can be found in the IDNs EPDP wiki space. Recordings will be

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

posted shortly after the end of the call. Please remember to say your name before speaking for the transcript.

As a reminder, those who take part in the ICANN multi-stakeholder process are to comply with the expected standards of behavior. Thank you and over to our Chair, Donna Austin, please begin.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks very much, Devan, and welcome everybody to today's call. My thanks to Justine and the team for filling in for me last week while I took some time out. And thanks, everybody, who joined the webinar yesterday. I think it may have seemed like we had light attendance, but we did conduct the webinar at an Asia-Pacific more friendly time, and maybe that's why we didn't have stronger attendance, but I was pleased with the attendance that we did have. So thanks to folks that attended that webinar yesterday.

Apparently, it's not normal to have a webinar for reports that are published for public comment, so, or policy development processes that publish reports for public comment, so maybe people just aren't used to it.

So we don't have as yet any requests to extend our public comment deadline, so we're still intending to close it, I think the date is the 5th of June, but it could be longer than that, but that's still the intent. So unless we receive any requests to extend the deadline, we will stick with what we have on the 5th of June, which isn't too far away.

All right. So we are going to pick up the discussion from last week. Steve is going to do a recap, and then we'll pick up the conversation again from last week. Oh, and Emily's also reminding me that one of the initiatives coming out of the GNSO and policy development processes—and this might be a PDP 3.0 initiative—is for PDP working groups or teams to conduct a self-assessment, and leadership has agreed that we will conduct that between phase one and phase two, so in the next few weeks, actually few days, we will send, or you will receive something from the secretariat that goes towards that self-assessment. Emily, is there anything you wanted to mention about the assessment itself, just to give folks a little bit of a flavor of what to expect?

EMILY BARABAS:

Hi, Donna, sure. So as Donna mentioned, this is a newly—so currently as standard practice, the GNSO and its working groups conduct a self-assessment at the end of every working group, but the GNSO has just approved a new tool and process for doing, as Donna mentioned, sort of interim assessments at key milestones and groups. So this one, it's standard in terms of what's in it, and some of the questions are similar to the end of life or end of PDP working group self-assessment, and some are specifically targeted at looking at opportunities for improvement as the group continues, including some questions about the leadership team. So it's going to be open to members, alternates and participants, and we'll leave it open for three weeks, so look out for that email with instructions on the link, and your feedback is appreciated. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay, thanks very much, Emily. So Steve, are you ready to do the recap? And my apologies to Steve, with Ariel out for a couple of weeks, it means that Steve is doing the extremely early shift. So if we can just cut Steve a little bit of slack here, I think he'd probably appreciate it. So Steve, I'll hand it over to you.

STEVE CHAN: Thanks, Donna. As Donna noted, the intention is to try to do a recap from last week's meeting and then carry forward from where the conversation basically ended. So for the recap, here's the set of charter questions we're considering right now, this is C4, C5, and C6.

C4 is really the core question as it's labeled here. It's about whether harmonization is needed. And so what was covered last week is basically what harmonization is and why it's needed. So the definition that was presented, or I guess the explanation of what it is, is when variant relationships between any two given second level labels are consistently defined across all the IDN tables offered by the gTLD and its variant TLDs.

And then secondarily, why it's needed for C4 is by way of example, there can be two IDN tables for the same script that have different variant relationships. And so continue with example, one could recognize a string as a variant while the other table does not. And then so the impact is that you could potentially have one registrant register one domain or one variant, and then another registrant using a different table could potentially apply for a different variant, or I guess two domains that are variants of each other. And that outcome could be different if you use a

different combination of tables or something to that effect. And so that's the impact and why harmonization is important.

Question C5, there's a bunch of text, but essentially what it's asking is whether or not, well, it's saying that if harmonization is needed, then how should it be accomplished? And then C6 is also in essence about how harmonization could be effectuated. And in this case, it's whether or not the IDN tables, the format should be specified, i.e. XML. Next slide.

This is the same slide, but it's just highlighting C4 because that's what we're going to cover first. And then slide five is the discussions about whether harmonization is needed. And so in blue, you can see the really quick and summarized version of the deliberations from last week.

And what it basically says is that the group understands what harmonization is and why it's important. And from the end of last meeting, there's about 10 to 15 minutes of deliberations. And it's all obviously subject to what's discussed here, too. But from last meeting, it said what we heard was basically that while there does need to be a check-in with the respective groups, from a principle level, it seems that there is trending support for pursuit of the conservative approach. And that's requiring that applicants and registry operators, as they will become, they must harmonize their IDN tables for a given TLD and any variant gTLDs.

So like I said, most of the last meeting was really about setting foundations and having discussions along the way. And there really were only about a handful of minutes, 10 to 15 minutes of deliberations, but it seemed that there was quickly coalescing

around, yes, harmonization is needed. So I'll pause for a moment and see if there's anyone that recollects differently, or maybe their assessments have changed. Maybe they've had conversations with their representative groups or all pointing groups.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Steve. Just on that last part, I guess the important question is whether folks have had a chance to talk with their respective groups on the issue of harmonization and whether we're in a position to kind of confirm what we heard from last week. Dennis?

DENNIS TAN: Hello, Donna, everyone. So the Registries Stakeholder Group have not had a conclusive conclusion on this position of harmonization, but leading towards supporting, I mean, being conservative and supporting the harmonization. But again, we have not fully discussed the whole topic, but early conversations point to that direction. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks Dennis. And I see from Satish that the ALAC is currently discussing the phase one report, so they haven't had time to discuss the harmonization issue. Okay. So I think we're okay with this as a recap, and I think it's on the right path. Thanks, Steve.

STEVE CHAN:

Thanks, Donna. And actually, just to remind everyone, what we're looking at right now is the recap of deliberations, just in respect of future applicants. And so there's a couple slides that the group didn't get to last week, which are about the existing registrants or existing registry operators, actually. So we'll cover that in a moment.

So the next part of the recap is to cover the recap for new applicants or new registries in respect of C5 and C6. And as a really quick reminder, this is about the mechanism for harmonization. So if the group is indeed trending towards requiring harmonization, then this is, these two questions are about how to do it. So again, you'll see the deliberations captured and summarized in blue here. And so what occurred last week was, the team looked at a couple of examples. There were two that came from the staff paper. One was about extending each of the individual tables that exist now, to make sure that they cover the IDN relationships, and that they're mutually coherent, or consistent and harmonized. And then the other option that they looked at was extending the label check process. So perhaps creating a separate table that just captures the variant relationships. And that can be relied on instead to identify the variant relationships consistently. And then there was also an anecdote from Michael Bauland about the method that his registry uses for their back-end registry support.

And so where the team seemed to be trending towards was recognizing that these can all be options. But there seemed to be a preference emerging that it's preferred that while harmonization should be required, it should be left to the registry operators to

determine how to achieve harmonization. So that set of deliberations and the summarization is in respect of C5. And so I'll pause again, see if there's any questions or comments about that summary. I think that was a decent pause. Thanks to Satish for the agreement. No hands raised. All right. And thanks, Dennis.

So the next part, this is about C6. And again, as a reminder, this is about really the format of the table. So what the team looked at last week was really about the evolution of the IDN table format in the various RFCs. And where it was, I think for 3743 and 4290 was about the TXT format and then 7940 switched to XML.

And so what was discussed last week is that many registries do not actually take the IDN tables as inputs to their systems. Rather, the tables are really exports of how the systems operate. So the tables themselves are not how registries implement the identification or I guess the utilization of the IDN tables and identification of variants. It's really the IDN tables serving as an output in order to meet the requirements from ICANN.

And so if an XML format were required, it would just mean that the registries are exporting their IDN tables in a different format potentially, or maybe it's already the format that they use to export. So in essence, if the XML format were used for many registries, it wouldn't necessarily change how the system inputs. The team also looked at an anecdote from Zhang Zuan about how the Chinese domain name consortium coordinates and manages their Chinese IDN tables or table. And then there's concerns expressed about considering the adoption of 7940, which is the XML format in essence, or the reference LGR, which both appear to be outside of the scope of C6.

And so this is probably consistent with the output of C6 or the discussions of C6 where there's still support for the requirement for harmonization, but again, leaving it up to the registry operators to determine how to achieve harmonization. And with that, I'll pause again, see if there's any questions, comments or different recollections about last week's deliberations.

No hands raised. I see a comment from Satish about for 7940 that there might be continued deliberations about that question in relation to other charter questions. And I honestly cannot remember off the top of my head where that might apply, but we can take that back. Sarmad, go ahead.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Thank you. This is Sarmad. So unfortunately I had to step away towards the end of last meeting to take a flight. So I guess I'm not commenting on this, but I guess I wanted to ask if I'm opening up for comments generally, then I have a couple of comments in this context. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: I think, go ahead Sarmad.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Okay. So I think the point of course is well taken. The way registries implement IDN tables in their systems is very dependent on the registry's own system. So the context of having these IDN tables in LGR format is in the context of them getting published in IANA repository. And the suggestion for RFC 7940 LGR format

was I guess as an alternative to the text format was that because this format allows us to process tables, I guess less manually and through machines. And that has some advantages.

DONNA AUSTIN: Sorry Sarmad, could I just ask a question? When you say us, who are you referring to as us?

SARMAD HUSSAIN: So it could be, for example, anybody who's using IANA tables. So it could be, of course, or looking at IDN tables, processing them. So it could be ICANN during review, but it could also be other registry operators which are looking at IDN tables for from other registries while designing their own IDN tables, because that's also one of the things which is encouraged.

So the advantage, of course, is that the LGR definition is much more precise because it's machine processable versus the rules generally which are written in English. So when somebody is, for example, referring to one of these IDN tables in text format, they may or may not interpret the rule the same way it was intended, versus if it is published in LGR format, then the rules are obviously formally specified and there's lesser chance of misinterpretation. That's one thing.

But it also allows many more, for example, automatic operations. You know, the case in point, of course, is normalization, sorry, or this harmonization. If it's in the RFC 7940 form, one could do harmonization relatively automatically in text formats that may be still possible, but some of it may actually be manual. So those are

some of the advantages. It's, of course as I said, I think that point is well taken that internally registry systems are certainly implementing these tables in their own ways through software. I guess the question was whether sharing them publicly through IANA, is it useful to do that in a machine readable format? Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Sarmad. Satish.

SATISH BABU: Thanks, Donna. Satish for the record. So from what I recollect, we did discuss the fact that the XML 7940 would be machine parsable and so several tasks could be automated. But it was pointed out that perhaps that is not within C6. We also said that in case of transfer of the entire registry itself to some other, I mean, the TLD to another registry, the XML format will help because different registries have different systems, but this is a kind of standard that's emerging. So that might help us.

But it is pointed out that there's a flip side to that, which is there is a tremendous amount of effort and perhaps resources required to do that shift. And the fact that this might be coming up in some of the charter questions. So strictly speaking from C6, these considerations may not apply, but it might come up in other charter questions. So in a sense, we have kind of parked that issue whether we should require 7940 or not until later. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Satish. My review of the recording seemed to suggest similar to what you're reflecting on that C6 is probably not the charter question to consider this topic, but it also seems that it would be a very resource intensive process to actually have a requirement where registry operators would have to change out from what they're currently doing to something different. I think Michael said as a backend registry operator, it could take in the order of 12 months to do. So I think that was a consideration as well. So I think that was some of the concern that I recall from listening to the recording. Maxim?

MAXIM ALZOBA: Actually, I'd like to underline that it's not just time, it takes time. It also takes money because the coders or engineers, they don't work for free. So and they will have to do it instead of something useful. So the registries will have to invest money into something which doesn't give something in return. I mean, changes for sake of changes, it's a bad idea because it just effectively loss of time and money. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks Maxim. And I think some of the stats that Ariel had in the slides from last week is that current IDN table format, so those that are in text, are almost 13,000 and those in XML are about 1200. So it would be, one would assume, a significant lift if you just go on those numbers. So I think that was part of the concern. So it's not an insignificant undertaking for registry operators. Having said that, what we're talking about here is future applicants. But I don't know that we can discount the fact that while the IDN tables are implemented by the registry operator, it's usually something that is done by the RSP has oversight of and

that, sorry, the backend registry operator that has oversight of that. So that is a much smaller number of organizations. Okay, thank you. Okay, so I think we can move on, Steve.

I have one question and excuse my ignorance, but with RFCs, is there a point in time where RFCs are ratified to the extent that they do become a technical requirement, or they're just in suggestion mode? Sarmad?

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Actually, one more thing in this context is that three RFCs are of course, of multiple types, the earlier ones 3743 and 4290 are both categorized as what are called informational RFCs. But the RFC 7940, which is a later one is a standards track RFC, which means that it has actually been recommended as a standard by IETF. So that's also one more difference between the earlier ones and the current one. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: And when you say it's a recommendation, that's not a must, that's a kind of a this would be nice kind of recommendation?

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Well, IETF categorizes this as standards track. So I think that's what it probably suggests that it should be taken up as a standard. I can get more information about how that should be interpreted. But again, I'm not really sure if I can add more at this time. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay, thanks. Maxim?

MAXIM ALZOBA: If the particular RFC is mentioned in the contract agreement or some policy, then a registry or registrar to whom it's applicable have to follow it. If it's just some kind of RFC, then it's not. It's something you don't have to follow. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks very much, Maxim. Okay, and Dennis is putting chat that in general, all IETF outputs are recommendations for standards. It is up to the businesses and organization to make a judgment call to make them requirements. So in our industry, we adopt IETF standards by consensus policies or contract obligations. So the way that RFC 7940 would become a requirement is either through consensus policies, which is what we're doing here or separate contract negotiations, bilateral negotiations between ICANN and the contracted parties. Okay, so we're good to move on, Steve?

STEVE CHAN: I think so. All right, so that ends the recap part of it. There were two slides I mentioned that the group didn't get to. And so as a reminder, this is about future applicants. And I think some of the deliberations did stray probably into what might apply for an existing registry about how the IDN tables are currently deployed, in that they're coded in and they're not actually taking the IDN

inputs or IDN tables inputs. So some of that might actually apply to the next set of slides. Which you're going to see here.

And so now the discussion questions, they shift to existing registry operators. And I can quickly read them. And so these are about existing IDN tables that are already implemented by existing registry operators. So you'll see some of the same baseline questions here. It's about whether or not harmonization should be a requirement. And then two is about if yes, then should there be any specific harmonization mechanism recommended? And then a sub question of that is should the XML format as recommended by RFC 7940 be required retroactively for already implemented IDN tables? And I think that's the reference I just made to on the previous slide about existing practices that probably applies here.

And then lastly, I think there's a new question here. It's about asking again, if the answer to one is yes, that harmonization is needed, what would be the effect of harmonization on existing registrations? So I will pause there and actually probably pass the Donna to handle discussions.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks, Steve. Okay, so I guess it's helpful that we've had the conversation last week, but now switching similar conversation, but for existing registry operators, what's the thinking on whether harmonization should be a requirement? So obviously, part of the discussion needs to be around question three as well, because I think that will somehow inform whether there should be a harmonization requirement for existing registry operators.

So interested to hear folks' thoughts on this, particularly, I guess our registry and registrar colleagues who are dealing with this on a daily basis. So any thoughts on this one? Sarmad?

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Thank you. Not sharing thoughts, but just suggesting that if we can—perhaps one way to look at it is to divide this into two parts. You know, harmonization is largely motivated to solve a security kind of challenge. And one, of course, part is that should tables be harmonized moving forward, so that there's no additional registration issues, which would be created, and then separately from that how to deal with existing registrations, which are already there. So maybe there are two different, I guess, parts to this question, possibly. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Sarmad. Dennis?

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Donna. So when we're talking about existing ROs, we are referring to the single TLDs, right, as opposed to the variant set of gTLDs. But if harmonization becomes a consensus policy in the variant set TLD, it will not be good practice to be inconsistent and not apply harmonization within a single TLD. So I think the likely outcome, again bearing any strong objection from the registry, but I don't think that's going to happen, harmonization also needs to be consistent across namespaces, if you will, whether it's a single TLD or a variant set of gTLDs, harmonization should be across the board. And what to do with existing

registrations? Well, that's going to be whenever we cross that bridge, we're going to make an assessment and do something, right, barring any significant security issues there. I think the longstanding practice is to grandfather registrations, but moving forward, the new registrations will need to be subject to the new rules.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks, Dennis. So to what you're suggesting, if there is harmonization policy that comes out of this work, then the question of whether it's for existing registry operators and new registry operators, it should be considered one and the same. So if there's that requirement, then it applies to all. But for existing registry operators, to Sarmad's point, it would be from a point in time that that harmonization becomes a requirement. And the likely outcome would be that for existing registrations at the second level, there would be grandfathering, but there would be a point in time moving forward where the harmonization comes in for existing registry operators as well. Sorry, that seemed to be very long winded. But if I understood you correctly, I think that's what you were saying.

Okay. All right. So I guess a question for maybe Sarmad and Dennis, and understanding that we don't currently have variants at the top level, have there been any security challenges with the registration of IDNs at the second level that we're aware of using the existing IDN tables that may not have been harmonized by registry operators do we, do we have any data on that? Sarmad?

SARMAD HUSSAIN: There's certainly been anecdotal kind of evidence, which has been published. I think the [inaudible] example, which I shared actually comes from an external source. Potentially, I think it was something published a few years back. But we've not done analysis on how many of these registrations are out there, though these kinds of things have been pointed out in the community. So we don't have data, but there is certainly anecdotal discussion. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks Sarmad. And I don't think this was touched on last week, but it could have been, but do we have any data on how many registry operators currently harmonize their IDN tables?

SARMAD HUSSAIN: No, we don't have that data because this is not a requirement. So this is not something we, I guess we look at. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay. All right. So, is there any more discussion for us to be had here? Don't know if we have any of our registrar colleagues on the call that could have any thoughts on whether harmonization should be a requirement for existing arrows. Sorry, Justine, what was the data point suggested in the charter? How many registry operators actually harmonize their IDN tables at the moment?

JUSTINE CHEW: The data point that was suggested was the number of registries that use machine readable LGR format specified in RFC 7940 for their second level IDN tables.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay. Sarmad?

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Yeah, just, I think if they use the LGR format doesn't necessarily mean that they will harmonize. So that's an additional operation. And I guess eventually each registry operator can themselves share whether they do any harmonization, but it's not something which we can, I guess, which we have looked at. We can certainly look at existing IDN tables and do that analysis. But currently we probably don't have tools to do it. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay. Thanks Sarmad. Okay. So it doesn't seem that there's much more discussion to be had here. So I guess all we've got is Dennis's thoughts on that harmonization should be a requirement regardless of whether you're an existing RO or a soon to be registry operator. The only difference here is that perhaps there's some grandfathering for existing registrations, second level registrations, but there would be a point in time where harmonization becomes a requirement for existing registry operators as well. So I don't see any more thoughts in chat and no hands. So what's next, Steve?

STEVE CHAN: Before we move on, maybe just to speak a little bit longer about the last point. So the idea that the existing registrations would be grandfathered, there could be another piece for discussion there, which is that if the domain that's already registered is dropped, then potentially the registry would then have to enforce harmonization going forward too. And so I'm not sure if there's other options that the group might want to consider beyond grandfathering. As Dennis mentioned, that's a pretty common practice for when a new policy comes into play. And I think maybe the other option, which might not sound too palatable is that you actually try to force harmonization for existing registrations where you have to try and pick which of the registrants between the variants that gets the primary. So I'm not sure if there's any other options, but like Dennis said, a pretty common practice is that you end up grandfathering and have a going forward policy effective date. S

DONNA AUSTIN: o Steve, when you say the domain is dropped, do you mean the registration is not renewed? The domain name is not renewed?

STEVE CHAN: Yep. That was my colloquial phrasing, but yeah.

DONNA AUSTIN: Right. Thanks. Dennis?

DENNIS TAN:

Thank you, Donna. Just to build upon Steve's use case, the registration renewal, what's the difference? At least Verisign, a renewal is different from a delete and re-registration. When you renew, you are really just extending the term of the registration. And typically that renewal will not pass through registration rules. It's just extending the expiration date.

Whereas when a domain name is deleted, dropped, and then out from the registry database and it's registered again or a re-registration, whether it's the same registrant, registrar, or a new registrar or registrant, that is a new registration and as such is subject to the federal policy of registration rules at that moment in time. So if at that moment in time there are other variant relationships, policies, commonization, what have you, that domain name registration is subject to those new rules. So I think that's right. One thing is renewing and another thing is re-registration. And re-registration, that's where those domain names will be subject to the new rules, but renewals will just extend the expiration date, at least in the very sign case. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Okay. Thanks, Dennis. So just on the question of grandfathering, if we can try to have a little bit of specificity around the grandfathering period and how that would work. So Justine's questioning whether it should be a limited period for grandfathering and I'm wondering whether the grandfathering applies to registered names prior to a nominated date. So when we use the term grandfathering here, what's the parameters for the grandfathering? And Alan's saying that he thinks it would be useful to have some research on second level domains that

currently exist but would be denied under harmonization rules, say with counts of the affected domains grouped by script or language so we have an idea of how many domains would be grandfathered and how much a security issue it might be.

I think that would be nice to have data, Alan. I'm not sure that we have the resources available to us to provide that, but perhaps there's some anecdotal information. So what Sarmad said is that the registration of [Epic] at the second level is something that's been identified. So, yeah, it would be a nice data set to have, but I'm not sure how easy it would be to get that.

So any thoughts on parameters for grandfathering? Okay. I don't see any hands, so I won't belabor the point. Steve, what's next?

STEVE CHAN:

Not a whole lot, honestly, which is partly why I wanted to extend that conversation a little bit. It seemed like there was still space for discussion. So thanks for that.

The next slide is continuing about existing registry operators. And this might be really fast because it's talking about new IDN tables that would be submitted by an existing registry operator. And so the question is, should those new IDN tables be subject to the requirements for harmonization as well?

And then the secondary question is quite similar. It's about if yes, harmonization is required for new IDN tables submitted, then should the mechanism for harmonization be specified or prescribed? So the question is quite familiar. It's just a slight nuance on the sets of relationships. So yeah, it's the existing

registry operator submitting a new IDN table. That was very brief, but hopefully that makes sense.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Steve. So any thoughts on this? It seems to be a distinction without a difference. I'm not sure I understand. Dennis?

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Donna. Yeah, I think it's more of the same and likely the same output. I don't think that makes sense to break out the different processes for it just makes a disservice to the IDN product as a whole, right? That certain pieces of the product need to behave this way, other pieces of the product behave in different fashion. I think when we're talking about harmonization applies to all the states, all the registry operators, existing, new and what have you, so that it's consistent.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay, thanks, Dennis. So Justine is asking whether inconsistency is warranted? Do you want to expand on that, Justine?

JUSTINE CHEW: Yeah, sure. I can try. I mean, this is just throwing it out as food for thought. One of the aims, I suppose, about harmonization was to make sure that registries are using tables consistently throughout. I guess there's different levels of what you mean by consistency as well, I guess. But in a sense that if we do something, if we have one practice for existing domain names, for existing tables, but

with the new ones, if we have a different rule for those, does that make sense in terms of inconsistency?

And one of the arguments against making new rules for the existing ones is that because you would run into all sorts of challenges, which is like trademark holders, like Maxim says, existing registrants already having certain practices in place or their business interests or whatever. But those challenges don't appear to exist yet because of names that which aren't registered yet, obviously.

So if we were to apply the new rules, we would possibly take care of some of the problems that we were trying to look into by having new rules, right? And without all the challenges that are in place with existing domain names.

But then the question is, where I came to, is the inconsistency warranted in that respect? I hope that makes sense.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks, Justine. Any thoughts on that? I'm not 100% sure that we will end up with necessarily inconsistent practices, perhaps some inconsistent outcomes. Dennis?

DENNIS TAN:

Thank you. It's an interesting question. Maybe I'm going to look at from a different angle and provide you just insights or point of view. We're not talking about all registry operators being consistent and having identical IDN implementations, same IDN

tables and all the bind rules and relationships and policies the same, right? We're not talking about that type of consistency.

We're talking about very specific, narrow scope consistency within a namespace. And when I'm using this term namespace, I'm talking about the TLD or the variant set TLD, right? Since we're talking about variant at the top level. So variants at the top level. Let me just oversimplify the space as a single namespace. And so in a single namespace, you want to have consistency across the variant relationships that the registry applies across the namespace. So that's the kind of consistency that we're talking about.

And my point of not looking at different outputs or outcomes depending on is a new gTLD, existing gTLD, existing registration or new labels, it doesn't make sense to break those apart. But we're talking about harmonization within a namespace. That's a good thing that addresses some of the security concerns. So let's have that across the board.

But still, each registry operator within a namespace will have the prerogative and the right to define their own policies, right? Subject to established practices, RFCs that we adopt and other contract obligations and what have you. So I think we are driving toward that and we are getting there. So just my two cents there. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN:

So looks like Maxim was agreeing with what Dennis said. So Steve, have we exhausted conversation?

STEVE CHAN: Maybe. I would say we exhausted the slides. But yeah, maybe we've also exhausted discussion as well. But yeah, this is the last slide.

DONNA AUSTIN: So I wonder, consistent with practices that we had from phase one, there's part of me that thinks that we'd be beating a dead horse here if we tried to have another conversation around this before—You know, I think we're in a position where we can potentially draft some text around—with some of the discussion and possible recommendations to the charter questions. So maybe that's something that we could do and then come back to the next time we have the conversation that will be around the recommendations based on the conversations we've just had and from last week. If that sits okay with folks.

Okay. So I guess the good news is that I think we allocated quite a bit more time in our how long do we think it's going to take us to discuss these questions. It looks like we might have. We've done better than expected. So I think what we'll do is just go ahead and build some draft recommendations and then we can come back and discuss that at a later time. Steve, do we have a sense of what we'd be discussing next week?

STEVE CHAN: Thanks Donna. So yeah, I have a pretty good sense of that. One is a definite. There's a half the meeting will be dedicated meeting

with SSAC SMEs on IDN table. So that's—exactly, thanks Justine. So that's I think the second back half of the meeting.

And then the first half is indeed what Justine suggested C1, C2 and C3, which are about the same entity principle. And then also about how that might be achieved. So for instance, the ROID could be one way to help enforce the segmented requirements. So yeah, that's the projected path forward.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Okay. Thanks Steve. So just a reminder that next week SSAC will be joining us in the second half of the call, and the intent of that is to have a conversation with them about our phase one recommendations. We're kind of interested to have a conversation with them on any of the recommendations that may not sit very well with them so that we've got a little bit of a heads up before we see their input to the public comment process. But it's also an opportunity for us to perhaps provide more layers of information and detail to the recommendations that perhaps aren't obvious from reading the text. So that's why we're having the call with them next week.

Also, I think next week I will be presenting at the GNSO council meeting to provide them with information about our revised timeline. And in the context of the requests that came from the board to the GNSO council about work efforts that have dependencies with kicking off the next round. So I think that's, Steve, is that next Thursday as well? 25th?

STEVE CHAN: Correct. Same day as our meeting.

DONNA AUSTIN: Yeah. Okay. So that will be happening next Thursday as well. So a bit of a busy day next week. So I guess that's it. Not much sense hanging around if we've got nothing to talk about. Steve.

STEVE CHAN: Thanks, Donna. I don't want to make us hang out any longer than we need to. But just to add a couple of things to the points you made. One is for the meeting next week with the SSAC. Just to help folks understand the preparation aspects. There was a communication sent to our counterparts, my counterpart, that supports the SSAC, Steve Sheng. And what was provided was essentially a mapping of the charter questions and recommendations from this group that touch on the early input from the SSAC as well as any relevant SSAC advice, like SAC00 whatever the numbers might be. So essentially there's a mapping between this group's recommendations and the inputs from the SSAC so that they can prepare in advance. We've asked them if they have any questions in advance to of course provide them. So hopefully that will help make that a useful conversation.

And then the second part that I just want to touch on is in relation to the meeting with the GNSO Council. One of the things that leadership has mentioned before I think is the suggestion that a face-to-face set of sessions outside of an ICANN meeting might help speed up the timeline. So in summary, after having conducted analysis of the charter questions and determining

which ones might impact the applicant guidebook or registry agreement, basically action in the request from the board, this group is trending towards keeping everything into the same track, not creating the EPDP phase 2a and 2b. So there will just be a phase two. And so naturally that sort of means that the timeline for this group is about right where it was before. But the group is still looking for different ways to try to speed up that timeline. And one of those is a face-to-face set of meetings. And that is part of the slides to the council too. So I just wanted to make sure that folks know that. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks, Steve. So I wanted to say, I can't think of any reason why we wouldn't share the communication that you sent to Steve Sheng on the list. I think it might be helpful for the group. So unless you can think of a reason why we should, can you please go ahead and share that with the team?

And the other question I have is, do we know when the schedule for ICANN 77 will be published? And the reason I ask that question is that we know that we have four sessions lined up for the IDN EPDP at ICANN 77. So I'm just curious to understand where we have potential clashes with other meetings that might take some of our team away from the IDN sessions. So it would be good to know when the ICANN 77 schedule will be published, if anybody knows that.

Dennis, we don't have a tentative date for the face-to-face meeting, but we do understand from conversations that we have that it's at least a six-month lead time to have a face-to-face

meeting set up. And the other thing that Justine and I have discussed and have requested is that we would like to have it in an APAC location, given that the leadership team is in that region. So whether it's possible to do that or not, we don't know. The criteria that ICANN uses for finding locations will impact on that. But our understanding is that it's at least a six-month lead time.

Okay, and maybe once we've had the conversation with Council, that will accelerate that conversation and we'll have a better idea once we've had that conversation with Council. Yeah, LA might be in the Pacific for you, Dennis, but it takes at least 14 hours for me to get there. I don't know how long it takes Justine, but we're trying to cut down a little bit on our airtime. Anyway, it'll all work out.

All right, so I think that's enough filibustering for now. So I think we'll call it for today. We've got a busy call next week with some charter questions for phase two, and then we have to turn our mind back to phase one to have the conversation with SSAC. Alrighty, so thanks, everybody. We will see you next week.

DEVAN REED: Thank you all so much for joining. Once again, this meeting is adjourned. I'll end the recording and bye everyone.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]